

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

William Massaquoii,
Plaintiff
v.
Nev. Board of Parole,
Defendant

Case No. 2:25-cv-00444-JAD-MDC

Order Granting IFP Application but Dismissing and Closing Case

ECF No. 4

Plaintiff William Massaquoi brings this civil-rights lawsuit to redress constitutional violations that he claims he suffered while in the custody of the Nevada Department of Corrections (“NDOC”). On October 22, 2025, this court ordered Massaquoi to file an amended complaint by November 24, 2025.¹ That deadline expired, and Massaquoi did not file an amended complaint or otherwise respond.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.² A court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to obey a court order or comply with local

¹ ECF No. 6 at 8.

² *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

³ *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

1 docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of
 2 cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.⁴

3 The first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the
 4 court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of Massaquoi's claims. The
 5 third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal because a
 6 presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in prosecuting an
 7 action.⁵ The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits—is
 8 greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

9 The fifth factor requires the court to consider whether less drastic alternatives can be used
 10 to correct the party's failure that brought about the court's need to consider dismissal.⁶ Courts
 11 "need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a case, but must
 12 explore possible and meaningful alternatives."⁷ Because this action cannot proceed until and
 13 unless Massaquoi files an amended complaint, the only alternative is to enter a second order
 14 setting another deadline. But the reality of repeating an ignored order is that it often only delays
 15 the inevitable and squanders finite resources along the way. The circumstances here do not
 16
 17

18⁴ *In re Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting
 19 *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130).

20⁵ *See Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

21⁶ *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that considering less
 22 drastic alternatives *before* the party has disobeyed a court order does not satisfy this factor);
 23 *accord Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th Cir. 2002) (explaining that "the
 24 persuasive force of" earlier Ninth Circuit cases that "implicitly accepted pursuit of less drastic
 25 alternatives prior to disobedience of the court's order as satisfying this element[,] i.e., like the
 26 "initial granting of leave to amend coupled with the warning of dismissal for failure to
 27 comply[,]" have been "eroded" by *Yourish*).

⁷ *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

1 indicate that this case will be an exception. Setting another deadline is not a meaningful
2 alternative given these circumstances. So the fifth factor favors dismissal.

3 Having thoroughly weighed these dismissal factors, I find that they weigh in favor of
4 dismissal. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that **THIS ACTION IS DISMISSED** without
5 prejudice based on Massaquoi's failure to file an amended complaint by the court-ordered
6 deadline, leaving no claims pending. The Clerk of Court is directed to **ENTER JUDGMENT**
7 accordingly and **CLOSE THIS CASE**.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* [ECF
9 **No. 4**] is **GRANTED**. This status doesn't relieve Massaquoi of his obligation to pay the full
10 \$350 filing fee under the statute; it just means that he can do it in installments. And the full \$350
11 filing fee remains due and owing even though this case is being dismissed.

12 To ensure Massaquoi pays the full filing fee, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that **the**
13 **Nevada Department of Corrections must pay to the Clerk of the United States District**
14 **Court**, District of Nevada, 20% of the preceding month's deposits to the account of **William**
15 **Massaquoi, #1105061** (in months that the account exceeds \$10.00) until the full \$350 filing fee
16 has been paid for this action. The Clerk is directed to **SEND** a copy of this order (1) to the
17 Finance Division of the Clerk's Office and (2) to the attention of **Chief of Inmate Services for**
18 **the Nevada Department of Corrections** at formapauperis@doc.nv.gov.

19 Dated: December 18, 2025

20 _____
21 _____
22 _____
23 _____

U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey